

EXCEPTIONS

AGAINST

Will. Rogers's

CAVILLS

AT

J. P's Complaint, &c.

Taken out of his

SIXTH PART

OF HIS

Christian-Quaker.



---

*Out of thy own Mouth will I Judge thee, Luke 19. 22.  
Professing themselves to be wise, they became Fools, Rom. 1. 22.*

---

L O N D O N,

Printed for Benjamin Clark in George-Yard in  
Lombard-street, Bookseller, 1682.

# EXCEPTIONS

AGAINST

Wm. Rogers

C A V I L S

AT

the Court of Sessions

IN

SIXTH PART

OF

William Rogers

1454

Printed by Wm. Rogers, at the Court of Sessions, in the City of London.

L O N D O N

Printed for Benjamin Clark in George-Yard in  
1782, by Wm. Rogers, Bookbinder.

## Exceptions against William Rogers's Cavils, &c.

**T**O excuse himself from prevarication, where he saith, he hath cited my Fathers Testimony, *All together, as it lay, Word for Word, and not by parts and pieces*; he would evade the matter by saying, (pag. 19. of the said *sixth part*) that he called it *part* of a discourse, which I grant him: But yet he gives this *part* of a Discourse as an entire Testimony, calling it *par. 3. pag. 88. A Testimony, this Testimony, and the said Testimony, not part of a Testimony*; and in the next page, the Title is, *The Testimony of the said Isaac Pennington*, which I urged against him in my *Complaint*, as an additional demonstration of his unfairness, and he in his *Rejoynder* takes no notice of.

He goes on in the same page, saying, he began *at the beginning of a Paragraph, and so quoted about 8 or 10 Sides, without adding or diminishing a Word*. (Why did he not tell us so before in his *third Part*; if he had no design of imposing upon his Reader?) This is far from taking *All as it lies*, to take the middle and leave both ends, which did more immediately explain the sense of the whole: And so his Reader would have seen at first had he expressed himself as he doth now. He would be accounted a very unfair dealer between man and man, that had bargained to take a Commodity all together as it lay, and yet should cull out the middle. Surely the middle lies not next to hand: No, no, *William*, all thy Sophistry will not turn this off: It is too manifest an untruth.

Again, why should he take so much pains, to Copy out 8 or 10 Sides word for word, and at last leave off at the last Sentence, if he did not apprehend that Sentence would marr his Cause? What, could he take so much pains with those 8 or 10 Sides, and be at last so spent, he could not afford to give us two

or three Lines more, which wound up the rest, and belonged to it? Thy *Understanding Reader* thou appealest to, must be a very soft natured man, to believe thou wast without guile herein.

He saith, page 20. "We put no construction on his Father's words; but left the Reader free without endeavouring to impose any sense relating to these words: and yet his weakness (if not wickedness) is so great, as to declare that my *Deduction* (which in reality was *none* at all) was not genuine, &c. In contradiction whereunto, he but a few lines before, to manifest that no *perversion* can be proved against him, quotes this passage of his out of his former Book, viz. "Our end in citing this Testimony (to wit, my Father's) is that the impartial Reader may consider whether the said Testimony hath any coherence with that part of the Book of Government, which is objected against by us, &c. Now if citing a Testimony for a certain end, implies not a *Deduction* or *Inference* therefrom, I am weak indeed. What, oppose him to R. B. and yet make no *Deduction* at all? Say, J. P. saies thus, and R. B. thus, and no *Inference* in all this? Nor is it probable he would bestow the Copying of Eight or Ten sides upon us, without drawing any consequence at all.

And now I am upon this Subject, let me examine him yet further, and see whether I cannot produce more instances; that he hath made a *Deduction*, and a false one too, from the said Testimony. And first I betake my self to his *Title-page* of his *third part*, which I referred to in my *Complaint*, to make my Charge good. It runs thus:

"The third part of the *Christian-Quaker*, &c. manifesting that there is but two sorts of Government owned by the Children of the Light, or *Christian-Quaker*. One is, the outward Government, &c. The other is, the inward Government of Christ (who alone is Lord over the Conscience) which is not represented by persons (visible by carnal eyes) invested with power from him to execute outward Laws, Prescriptions; Orders, Edicts or Decrees in an outward form of Government, visible as aforesaid. And for the better Illustration of our meaning, an Answer to a part of R. Barclay's Book of Government is cited; to which is added a *Testimony* given forth in Print in the Year 1660. by Isaac Pennington the Younger.

From

From whence these Three Consequences naturally flow.

1. Printing a Testimony for better *Illustration*, shews that that Testimony was to make some *Illustration*. Now if no *Deduction* or *Inference* were drawn therefrom, nor that it had no reference to make good his foregoing Position, how could it be said to *Illustrate* at all?

2. If this Allegation of *W. R.*'s be repugnant to my Father's sense delivered in that Testimony, and he have laboured to insinuate the contrary, my charge of his *Deduction* not being genuine, and of his *traducing, abusing, mis-representing, and perverting* my Father's words, will stand the Test. Which that it is so, give me leave to repeat three passages out of the said Testimony, whereof two of them were over-look'd, the last cited by *W. R.* himself. The words are these:

*Thus the Apostles and other Ministers of Christ, had likewise in the Spirit the care of the Churches, and Authority in the Lord by his Spirit to Govern the Spirits of his people—Again, Everyone feeling a measure of the Spirit in himself, is thereby taught to own and Subject to a greater measure of the same Spirit in another; (see part 1. page 238. of my Father's Works.) This is far from W. R.'s Position, that the inward Government of Christ is not represented by persons visible by carnal eyes, because he alone is Lord over the Conscience, as if the Government were out of Christ's hands, when his Spirit and Power act through his Members. But alike truly may it be urged, that because God promised to teach his people himself, which John saw fulfilled when he told the Churches, Ye need not that any man teach you, but as the same anointing teacheth you, 1 John 27. therefore no persons (visible by carnal Eyes) are invested with power from him to teach, he being the Bishop and Shepherd of the Soul: and so exclude the Office of Pastors and Teachers, as entrenching upon Christ's Prerogative.*

Yet does *W. R.* himself (part 3. page 94.) bring in my Father, saying, *And every Member is to wait in the measure of the Spirit which he hath received, to feel the going forth of the same Spirit in him that teacheth and Governeth; and so to Subject not to man, but to the Lord, &c.* From whence two things are observable (which contradict the scope of *W. R.*'s context, and manifest the wrong use he would make of my Father's Writings.) The first is, That the Spirit so goes forth in some, as

in them to teach and Govern; and Secondly, Those that *Subjects* to men thus qualified (which is far from denying any are so) Subject not to *man*, but to the *Lord*.

3. A Third consequence which occurs from the premises is, that notwithstanding his endeavouring, *page 22.* to suggest my wronging him, because I tell him, his *Title-page imports, that the drift of that part of his Book is to tie up all to an inward Government of Christ, exclusive of any outward form of Government, Order or Discipline*: yet that from thence the same is very obvious. For what else can be the meaning of those words, *That the inward Government of Christ is not represented by persons (visible by carnal eyes) invested with power from him, to execute outward Laws, Prescriptions, &c. in an outward form of Government*; if he did not intend under the Notion of inward Government of Christ, to exclude all manner of outward form of Government, Order or Discipline, except he would have it represented by persons invisible to carnal eyes.

Nor have I done with him yet upon this Subject, for I must add one Instance more to prove he hath made Deductions and Inferences, from that which he Cited of my Fathers, which though it be pretty long, am willing to give my Reader, for a further taste of my Adversaries false covers, and in order to my own Vindication. It begins thus:

“Having now done with the Citation of what was writ in  
 “Answer to the aforesaid Book of Government, and considering that in the First Section, the Author wrote of a sort of  
 “Persons that would needs be *Innovators*, and given to change,  
 “and introducing new Doctrines and Practices, not only differing, but contrary to what were delivered in the beginning;  
 “and in *page 13.* seems reflectingly to treat on such kind of language as this, *I must stay till I be convinced*, as if such language was knockt down in the beginning: and as may reasonably be taken from the scope of the said Book, to reflect on  
 “such among the People called *Quakers*, who are not so zealously affected with the outward form of Government under  
 “the Notion of Church Government, pretended to be established amongst them, as the Author or Approvers of his Book  
 “were: *We think it necessary to cite a Testimony published in Print,*  
 “by Isaac Penington the Younger, &c.



If in all this there be no *Deduction*, when he gives such a large account why he thought it necessary to cite my Father, opposing him and Friends in the beginning, to what is received now amongst Friends, then I confess I am to seek for the Etymology of the word. Nay, doth he not tell us that his first Motive was, considering the Author wrote of a sort of Persons that would needs be Innovators, and introduce new Doctrine to what was in the beginning? But what then? what is that to us? or how doth it concern us, if *W. R.* hath made no *Deduction* or *Inference* with relation to my Father's sense for or against it, but hath left his Reader free, without putting a construction on it? which is not consistent with telling us, that upon such and such Considerations he thought necessary to cite it: for this is a manifest declaring the construction he would make of it.

Another Consideration he draws from page 13. of the said Book, upon which he thought necessary to cite my Father's words, or at least some of them, is, That his Author (as he alledgeth) *seems respectingly to treat; as if such kind of Language as, I must stay till I be convinced, were knocked down in the beginning.* Well, what of all this? What have we to do with his Author, if there be no reference made thereto, in citing part of my Father's words, of his allowing or disallowing such kind of Language? But then why was it brought here, as one of the Inducives to the Citation? Is not this manifest Contradiction, *William*? Dost thou not apparently thwart thy self? Was not thy third part writ to another end, than thou wilt own in thy Sixth.

But he goes on with a Third Consideration, opposing *scope* to *scope*, and telling us *the scope of the said Book*, seeming to be to *reflect on such among the people called Quakers, who are not so zealously affected with the outward forms of Government under the Notion of Church-government, we think it necessary to cite a Testimony, &c. Entituled, The Authority and Government, which Christ excluded out of Church, &c.* And what, no Deduction in all this neither? Doth he not hereby endeavour to insinuate my Father's sense in those daies concurred not with the zealously affected persons now adaies? especially when we consider that after he hath promised to take it *all together, word for word, and not by parts and pieces here and there*; yet he

left out the most remarkable passages, which could no waies admit of, but directly impugned such a construction, as he ( notwithstanding his endeavouring now to palliate it ) sought to wrest therefrom.

Yet further on this occasion, I would ask him one Question, *Whether he himself be one of those zealously affected persons to the outward forms of Government, under the Notion of Church-Government, or no?* For if he be not, he hath no reason to take it ill of me, that I inferred he would *tye up all to an inward Government of Christ, exclusive of any outward form of Government, Order or Discipline*: and if he be, he hath an ill way of shewing it, when he would make Friends in the beginning to be of another mind. O the changeableness of this man, one while one way, another while another way; ( like the foolish Woman ) pulling down his House with his own Hands! O that he could see whither he is run, through spurning at counsel, and be warned for the future!

But suppose ( saith he, page 20. ) *I had not worded my meaning so cautiously, as to have signified only a part of his Father's discourse, &c.* Why hadst thou so done, and ingeniously have confessed it, I would never have trod upon thee. But what if the case be otherwise, and that thy design was to traduce, and now thou art pinched, wouldst seek a hole to creep out at, must not I tell thee, thy way is hedged up, and this and the other passage makes against thee. It would be well for thee, thou couldst at length learn to distinguish between weakness and wilfulness, ignorance and premeditated abuse.

He adds, *Might not all publick Preachers or Writers by the same Rule be reflected on, when they have quoted by way of Testimony or Illustration a part only of another's Testimony?* *Ans.* Yes; if they affirm that part to be the whole, and to be taken all together as it lies, and not by parts and pieces, and wrest that part as an instance of their opposition to their Brethren they are in unity with. The like Answer may serve for his Marginal Note, where from my citing but part of my Father's Testimony, and not declaring 'tis only a part (saith he, but is mistaken) though I never said 'twas the whole, he would prove me worthy of worse reflections. *thau*, he saith, *I gave him.*



I do also acknowledge that some passages of my Fathers, quoted even by *W. R.*, do make against *W. R.*, nor do I wonder at it, he being not the first Adversary by many, that hath given occasion to be beaten with his own weapon.

What he terms, page 21. *undeserved reflections*, as if I and others had our *Educations at Billingsgate among the Scolds*, I return as frothy, envious and unfavoury; who though I had a just dislike of the man's unworthiness, yet wrote those lines in great calmness and serenity of mind, and was never scurrilous to him in my language; nor yet sharp, but where my matter spoke for me. And better were it for him to clear himself of my Charge of *dealing fallaciously, surreptitiously, and unrighteously*, than to term it *Billingsgate language*, which I believe he never heard there.

In the same page he quibbles at my saying, *He leapt over some leaves*, *Explanatory of the rest*, as if it were Non-sense, but it is true enough, for the beginning shews the occasion of what followed, and surely a *Question* and the first part of an *Answer*, must needs be *explanatory* of the rest of the *Answer*: as well as that it did not become one who promised to take it *all*, as it lay, to begin his quotation with the latter part of the *Answer*. Surely by this means his quotation, whatever he pretend (see page 21.) cannot reasonably be termed *Explanatory of what did precede*, but what did precede might open that which did succeed.

Now to that last clause of my Father's, which he left out, he (after he hath told me he made no Deduction from it, of which let the unbyassed judge) urgeth in excuse, that the words are *Prophetical*, signifying *what will come to pass*, not *what was come to pass*, page 21. and adds in the next page, *Since the occasion of my citing his Father's words, was only in relation to a Discourse touching what had been*, I should have shewn my self very impertinent, to quote his words *Prophetically spoken*. O William, this is a false gloss in God's sight, and I fear thou belyest thy own Conscience herein: for how can it be said to *Prophesie what shall be*, any more than to tell what *hath been*? The words are these, *And the Unity being thus kept, all will come into one outwardly also at length, as the Light grows in every one, and as every one grows into the Light*, &c. which is as much as to say, This is the natural tendency and effect of keeping the *Unity*, both where it

both been as well as where it is kept. And what Prophecy. is there in all this? Cannot he distinguish between a consequence upon a thing premised, and a prediction, or foretelling a thing, to come from the Mouth of the Lord? But he would fain have it so, which if it were granted, would neither help his cause, nor lessen his guilt, in leaving out the last Sentence, when he promised to give us *all together word for word*: For how shall that (which he terms a Prophecy) be fulfilled, if the means be rejected and withstood? How shall *all come into one outwardly also at length*, if the *diversities of administrations, gifts and operations* (which jar not, are not contrary though various; for the same fountain cannot send forth sweet water and bitter) I say, how shall it be effected if these *Diversities* must be urged, as opposing the breaking forth of *that day* (*W. R. sayes, He should rejoyce to see*) wherein we might all so be led by the appearance of *Christs spirit in us, under his Government, &c. as that this oneness might be witnessed among all the Families of Gods people?* See par. 3. pag. 83. To what end should these things be prophesied of, if none are to press after the mark, or that diversities of Gifts, wrought by the same Spirit, hinder this work? What is this but to say, the Spirit of God, through bringing forth these diversities of Gifts and Operations in the body, obstructs that *oneness*, which his *Soul should rejoyce to see*? O Confusion! O Darkness, that maybe felt!

I wave the reflection and Marginal Note that follows, pag. 22. on G. F. and others, not being privy to the matter; nor do I know what he would be at, it being only in general terms, and he may remember the old Maxime, *Sub universalibus latet dolus*. And I presume it is Answered elsewhere, by another Pen.

Now to come to his *Observations on what is Written in Relation to my Mother M.P.* which he toucheth very lightly, and wholly waves my *Postscript*, which summed up the thing.

He begins pag. 23. thus, "The Title Page imports, *That I have suggested that Mary Penington did shun suffering for Truth.*" 'Tis a very false Representation of what I have said concerning her: For there cannot be a shunning of Suffering for Truth, unless one shun that Suffering which Truth requires, which I never did charge Mary Penington with. And yet in pag. 5. he saith, "Witness his (*viz. G. F's*) advice to Mary Penington to secure Worldly Estate from the Spoiler, when 'twas likely to be seized for obedience to Christs Commands, &c."

"What

“What is Suffering for Obedience to Christs Command, no Suffering for Truth?

But hear him once more at the letter end of *pag. 23.* and *pag. 24.* “We cannot forsake the Assembling of our selves together, and in pursuance of Christs command we cannot swear, and in BOTH THESE our Testimony for Truth is concerned: And therefore I cannot but conclude, that as it related to avoid Sufferings, by reason of obedience to Christs Command, George Fox’s Counsel to her was not justifiable in him, &c. Here’s strange work, lay and unlay, give and take; one while, *I never did charge Mary Penington with shunning that Suffering which Truth Requires*; another while, *Suffering for not Swearing, is Suffering for Truth, as well as Suffering for Meeting*: Even now, *It was a very false Representation to say, he suggested M. P. did shun Suffering for Truth*: Anon, *He cannot but conclude, that as it related to avoid Sufferings by reason of obedience to Christs command, G. F’s Counsel to her was not justifiable in him*. O whether doth not prejudice and envy carry men? What blindness is happened to him, thus to grope at Noon-day? and so palpably to lay himself open to the lash of every half-sighted Reader?

But to return to *pag. 23.* where he saith, *G. F’s Paper of Queries reflects so far as Queries could, on such as secured any part of their Estates from the Spoiler*. What upon any Consideration whatever? Consult them again. (Or did thy *Credible Friend in Truth* inform thee so? Bring out thy Informer, and let us know) Did he imply ‘tis in no Case lawful to secure an Estate from the Spoiler, without any limitation whatsoever? What, not from a Thief, nor from a man that claims by a false Title? For he told us but a Line or two above, that my Mothers Suffering was not a Suffering for Truth in his account; and consequently he could not mean that. But then he must needs wrong *G. F.* exceedingly whose words in those *Queries* (as himself sets them down, *par. 5. p. 24.*) are, “All you that do make away or over your Estates for fear of the Spoilers in time of Persecution, for the sake of Christ and his Gospel, and the Worship of God, &c. And to this effect he expresseth himself over and over in those *Queries*. So that if he should see he hath overshot himself, and would recal his words again: Yet he ought (as *Tho. Lawrence* told him) to explain how much Goods may be hid, what sort of Goods, who may

do it, and in what cases it may, in what it may not be done, or he confounds things.

Yet to open the thing more plainly, I will take the pains to repeat the substance of that part of my *Postscript* in my *Complaint*, which handles this matter, that thou mayest see *G. F.* allows not in one, what he disallows in another, as

1. *My Mother was not the person under Prosecution for the Worship of God.*

2. *Nor did she go to secure her Estate from any Prosecution against her upon that account.*

3. *It was a Trapan; and the occasion not from any supposed Offence of my Fathers; relating to Religious Worship, but a Strata-gem to the Estate.*

4. *My Mother secured not my Fathers Estate, but her own, in order to save the right of Possession in her own hands, from any illegal seizure; which was her sole property, and not seizable for my Fathers pretended Offence, which is no ways parallel to any ones making over their own proper Estate, to shun suffering for their own particular Testimony in Meeting to Worship God.*

This he never touches upon, nor endeavours to invalid, but jumbles things confusedly together to darken the thing; for this shewing what *G. F.* smote at, and stating your two Cases, as they are, served not his turn. And now I am past wondering that I find him an unfair Adversary, for he hath injured me to expect no other.

He adds, "Whereas *Mary Penington* hath accused me, that "I have Aspersed Innocent Servants of the Lord, and have "brought forth nothing to prove that I have so done; I return "it as a false Charge, unbecoming the Pen of one that pretends "to an Innocent and Righteous Conversation, as she doth.

*Ans.* Their being manifest to her Conscience in the sight of God to be his Faithful Servants (had she no other ground for what she saith) is an undeniable proof with her, that they are no *Lyars, Double-minded men, Forgers of False-Certificates, &c.* with many other Scandals cast upon such, whom *W. R.* himself, had not prejudice deeply entred him, could not but give a far different Character of.

I must also tell him, that though he be offended at the reproof given him under the Instances of *Ham*, &c. (of which he treats largely from *pag. 5. to 9.*) yet they are very pat, and retain their force still: Nor will his flinging dirt on *G. F.* in a thing he cannot prove, but brings Certificates under the hands of such as are parties against him, take off the edge of the blow. For if *Ham* was not to take advantage of a real weakness against his Father, even before his Brethren (though *Noah* being overcome with Wine, did what was unseemly) how can *W. R.* be excused in exposing the pretended failings of an Elder or Elders, (whom he ought to *entreat as Fathers*, 1 Tim. 5. 1.) to both Brethren and Adversaries: For let him say what he will, that 'twas never his *Practice, Order or Advice to publish it amongst Priests*, *pag. 8.* Yet it is plain from the Book it self, and objections he obviated, not to be started by any Friend, that it was designed to go abroad among *Foes* as well as *Friends*.

And as to the instance of *David's* care to conceal *Saul's* death (who was his Enemy, and had lost his condition *Gaul's* ward) from the *Uncircumcised*, lest they should insult over *Israel*; it answers the matter in hand, notwithstanding his labour to evade it, and extenuate his offence. And how *W. R.* whatever Name he arrogate to himself, can be a *Christi-in-Quaker*, while he endeavours thus to bespatter the people he joyns himself to, and would be taken to be one of, and not a false Brother, to me seems a Paradox. For if the *Quakers* are so and so with thee, *Be seperate, go out from among them, renounce the Name Quaker, assume another Name to thy self*; and do not keep with them; Meet with them as one of them, and call thy self a *Quaker*, yea a *Christian-Quaker* too; and yet say, they are not Gods *Israel*. O this is shameful among men! and they will be ready to say, *It is an ill Bird that bewrays his own Nest*.

But he saith, *pag. 9. That Saul acknowledged his sin, and prayed that his sin might be taken away, &c.* Thereby rendering him a better man than *G. F.* and consequently deserving more favourable dealing. But did he *for sake and find mercy, as well as confess*? read 1 *Sam. cap. 28.* (the last place where any mention is made of *Saul*, before that of his falling upon *Mount Gilboa*) and then thou wilt see he had so provoked the Lord, and was so much another man to what thou renderest him, that the Lord would not Answer him either by *Dreams*, or by *Urim*, or by the  
Pre-

*Prophets*, so that he sought to a *Witch*, and the Answer *Samuel* made, gives no Character of *Saul's* acceptance with God, but foretells his overthrow. What Repentance was there in all this? O *William*, had *G. F.* made such a lame and false deduction, wouldst not thou have made work with it; But thy Folly must be made manifest. And seeing thou insistest so on 1-Sam. 15. 24, 25. I am to tell thee, it makes not at all for thee, nor gives any account of Gods accepting *Saul* again; but only that through his importunity *Samuel* was prevailed with to turn again after him and Worship the Lord, that *Saul* might not be dishonoured before the Elders of the people, as v. 30, 31. nay the last verse of that Chapter, and the first of the next do imply the contrary.

And for a further justifying himself in publishing pretended miscarriages to the World, he urgeth that *Paul* did the like by *Peter*, and said unto him before all men, if thou being a Jew, &c. pag. 5. But how doth he understand that word *all men*? Was it not *all that Auditoty*, before whom the offence was given? And was it not fitting he should do so? Is this parallel to *W. R's* Case? Doth this justify publishing Offences in Print among Unbelievers, not otherwise privy to it? Besides he cannot prove that that Auditory consisted of a mixt number of Believers and Unbelievers. It might, for ought he knows, be only an Assembly of such as were at least convinced, and the miscarriage being so publick, the reproof ought to be so too. Again, where did he meet with that Translation *all men*: My Bible hath it *them all*, nor is the word *Men* in the Greek; it is *ἡμετέροις πάντες* before all, or them all; which very thing shews clearly, that he did not go to sow Dissention among the Churches, or hinder the passage of *Peter's* Ministry among Unbelievers, that had no knowledge of the offence, and so not lyable to be stumbled or hurt thereby; for then it had been suitable to *W. R's* case and practice.

And whereas *Thomas Crisp* and himself have published that as *Edward Burroughs*, which, though each of them hath appeared in Print since, and that I publickly required them to make it good; yet neither of them hath either confessed their fault, or made good their Allegation herein, I must needs tell him as I did *T. C.* That it greatly detests the meanness of his Spirit, and shews the little regard he hath to deal justly and equally with those he opposeth: so unfair an Adversary is he.  
Be-



Besides that it is an injury to the memory of *E.B.* to have such a Paper laid at his door, who was known to be a man of a clearer understanding and judgment in the Truth, than diverse things in that Paper import: and moreover there is cause given to believe, that *John Perrot* was the Author of it, of which a further Confirmation is expected.

To Conclude, As this work is a work of Darknes, so is the *peace* that attends it, and which he so much boasts of, the *peace* which is obtained when the *strong man Armed keeps the House* (or rather when he re-entrencheth with *seven worse Spirits* then before) from which *peace*, the Lord keep all that have not sinned out their day.

J. P.

## Postscript.

Since these Sheets were in the Press, I have seen *T. C's* Reflections on me, stiled, *The second part of Babels-Builders unmasked*, which with him it seems, goes for an Answer; but finding little therein immediately to my self, but what *W. R.* hath said before him, saving disdain and scurrility, I presume these foregoing *Exceptions* may excuse my farther notice thereof. And my Charge upon him of Printing a Paper as my Fathers, upon the *sole* Authority of a professed Adversary (for other ground he gave me not, whatever he did to others) without consulting his Writings, and of Publishing that as *E. Burroughs* (lamentably mangled and transposed to boot, as I am inform'd) which proves to be none of his, is not yet wip'd off: only in the main he treats me with great scorn and contempt, and is so far from shewing the Fruits of a Meek Christian, forbearing Spirit (which he pretends to in his first Part, when he exclaims so against judging of others, or sitting upon *Christ's Seat of Judgment*, as he wordeth it) that his lines manifest his peevish, envious, enraged, and fretful mind, which his bad Cause wants, mine doth not. The rest is made up mostly of bitterness against *G. F.* and an espousing *J. S.* and *J. W's* Cause; who are men I believe, he

he would not have been concerned in or for; nor taken notice of, had they not run out from Truth. For what should make him, that hath so long been Luke-warm and unfaithful, and not look'd upon (by Faithful Friends who well know him) as a Friend for years, be so vigorous to stand by these men, were it not that their way is broad enough to receive him, though the Truth is too strait for him !

Yet how he can be a proper Advocate for their Cause, who would have a *liberty* (while in the profession of the Truth) *to pay Tythes, Marry with a Priest, and use the language Truth disowns*, while *J. S.* and *J. W.* have endeavoured to insinuate the contrary, as their Doctrine and Practice, I confess I see not, unless that to oppose Truth be a COMMON CAUSE.

And whereas he is so bitter, Prophane and flouting, speaking of *Foxonians*, *G. F's Laws*, *G. F's Orders*, which he terms, *The High Hedge or Wall, your Idol*, &c. as *page 2, 3, 7.* and elsewhere; it would be well he would exhibit to the World a Catalogue of those Laws, Orders, &c. that we may see whether they are things that are *Honest, Just, Pure, Lovely, of good Report*, and whether there be *any Vertue or praise in them*, Phil. 4. 8. (or the contrary) : for then they deserve no Epithites of Reproach and Obloquy, which he is very liberal of throughout his Book : as where he brands the proceedings and tender Admonitions given to *J. S.* and *J. W.* in order to reclaim them, and bring them to a sight of their decline, with the Nick-name of *Popery, Imposition, Pope's Bull*, &c. adding that *many bless God; some of them have no power to Milt or corporally punish.* (See *page 9, and 10.*) which are as black and malicious Charges as he can well cast, rendring Friends obnoxious to the Government, and bereft of humanity, and that from a man, that can have the face to call himself a Quakertoo, as *page 11.* O the impiety ! O the Obduracy, and Treachery of these men, that while they assume the name of Quaker, would prostitute the Cause of Truth to the fury of its Adversaries ! Surely *their anger is fierce, and their wrath is cruel*, Gen. 49. 7.

THE END.

